

Interview Summary

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Application No. 09/643,912 | Applicant(s) | Asami et al. | |
| | Examiner Tu M. Nguyen | Art Unit 3748 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tu M. Nguyen (examiner)

(3) _____

(2) Micheal N. Lau (attorney)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Dec 17, 2002

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 5-8

Identification of prior art discussed:

Tsuzuki et al. (U.S. Patent 5,801,499)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant argues that Tsuzuki does not increase temperature of catalyst and does not provide a positive load to the engine when the catalyst temperature is low. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in Figure 3 (step S13 with N answer and steps S28-S35) and Figure 6, Tsuzuki starts the engine operation when the catalyst temperature is below a threshold value and by charging a battery, Tsuzuki provides a positive load to the engine. Applicant further argues that Tsuzuki does not have any control for increasing catalyst temperature when the vehicle is running. The examiner, however, notes that this particular feature is not in the base claim 5. If claim 5 operates both when the vehicle is moving and not moving, then the amended claim 5 contains allowable subject matter pending further search and consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

THOMAS DENION
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Tu M. Nguyen

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.